REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 remain in the application. Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 1-4, 13 and 14 have been amended to address rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 2, 10 and 14 have been amended into independent form.

Claims 2-7, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner did not specifically identify claim 1 as being rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. However, the second and third sentences in the paragraph addressing the Section 112 issues suggests that the Examiner considered claim 1 to have Section 112 problems as well. In particular, the Examiner stated that it was unclear whether the applicant intended to have claim 1 define a power supply apparatus in combination with a door.

Neither claim 1 nor its dependent claims were intended to define the door or any other part of the vehicle as part of the invention. Rather, the door and the vehicle was recited in the claims with the intent of defining the environment in which the invention is used.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove all reference to the vehicle and the slide door.

Claim 2 has been amended into independent form and continues to recite the vehicle body and the slide door in the preamble. However, the preamble has been rewritten to clarify that the vehicle body and the slide door are mentioned only to define the environment in which the power supply apparatus is used. Neither the vehicle body

nor slide door is mentioned in the body of amended claim 2. However, a reference appears again in the "whereby clause" at the very end of the claim. "Whereby clauses" also are not considered to be structural limitations, but rather are intended to define the environment in which the claimed invention is used and functional aspects of the invention. It is believed that amended claim 2 addresses the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 3-7 have been amended to eliminate all references to the vehicle and the slide door.

The Examiner stated that it was not readily apparent whether claim 11 is claiming the cable guide or a cable guide in combination with a cable.

Claim 11 has been amended to eliminate all reference to the cable.

The Examiner raised a similar question with respect to claim 13. Claim 13 has been amended to positively recite the cable.

Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over the newly cited U.S. Patent No. 5,271,182 to Greisner et al. considered in view of Hackenberg. The Examiner stated that the Greisner et al. reference relates to a power supply apparatus (motor driving a closure) with a cable guide comprising link member 30, 30'. Each link member was considered to have a first tubular section 16 bent in one direction and a second tubular section 16' being bent only in an opposite direction. The Examiner stated that an intermediate portion can be bent into an S-shape with guides 84, 84' further limiting the pivotal movement between adjacent links. The Examiner acknowledged that Greisner et al. does not suggest a cable

extending within the links. However, the Examiner turned Hackenberg in an effort to overcome this deficiency of Greisner et al.

The rejection is based on the Examiner's conclusion that the link members 30 in the first tubular section 16 of Greisner et al. can bent in one direction while the link member 30' in the second tubular section 16' can bent only in an opposite direction so that an intermediate portion can be bent into an S-shape.

It is submitted, with respect that the Greisner et al. reference has no suggestion of any link member being capable of being bent in an opposite direction from other link members. To the contrary, it appears that all of the link members of Greisner et al. can bend only in one common direction. If the Examiner starts at the bottom left most link in Greisner et al., the adjacent link to the right can bend only in a counterclockwise direction. Bending in a clockwise direction is prevented both by the guide and by the generally oblong-shaped backs 64. If the Examiner continues link-by-link from the lower left extreme of the Greisner et al. chain, the Examiner will appreciate that each subsequent link only can bend in a counterclockwise direction. The Examiner will eventually reach the link near the number 18 which is joined to the holder 20. It is not clear that there will ever be rotation between the link 18 and the holder 20. However, any rotation that might exist would be in the same relative rotational direction as the rotation between the links 30 downstream from the holder 20. If the Examiner then continues this link-by-link progression from the link 18' to the link near the numeral 100, the Examiner will note that each subsequent link can only bend in a counterclockwise direction.

These restricted bending limitations might enable the Greisner et al. link assembly to achieve a C-shape. However, the Greisner et al. link assembly does not have a first section capable of being bent in a predetermined direction from a linear condition and a second section configured to be bent in an opposite direction from a generally linear condition. Stated differently, the Greisner assembly permits only counterclockwise bending when progressing from the left to the right. There is no change in bending direction in Greisner et al.

The rejection under 35 USC 103(a) also required the Greisner et al. device to be redesigned to accommodate a cable. It appears that the Greisner et al. device is specifically designed for delivering mechanical power and not for accommodating electrical power transmission. In this regard, the backs 64, 64' move into abutting relationship, so that adjacent backs 64,64' literally push a window open. The axes must be sufficiently big and strong to hold the entire Greisner et al. assembly throughout this pushing force. There simply appears to be no space in Greisner et al. for accommodating a cable. Thus, it is not at all clear that the Greisner et al. device could be adapted easily in the manner taught by Hackenberg.

To summarize, the Greisner et al. device has no part that bends in an opposite direction, and it is not clear whether Greisner et al. could be somehow be reconfigured to accommodate a cable.

The preceding comments apply equally well to claims 11-13. In particularly, claim 11 defines the cable guide as having a plurality of link members interconnected so that each link member can pivot relative to at least one adjacent link member. The cable guide of claim 11 is defined as having a first section and a second

section. The link members in the first section are configured so that the first section is capable of being bent in a predetermined direction from a generally linear condition. The link members in the second section are configured so that the second section is capable of being bent only in an opposite direction opposite to the predetermined direction from a generally linear condition. In Greisner et al., proceeding from left to right, each subsequent link member only can bent in a counterclockwise direction. Accordingly, it is submitted that the invention defined by amended claims 1, 11, 12 and 13 is not suggested by the hypothetical combination of Greisner et al. considered in view of Hankenberg.

Claim 10 was objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that claim 10 would be allowed if rewritten in independent from including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 10 has been amended into independent form with all the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 9. Hence, amended claim 10 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner indicated the claims 2-7 and 14 would be allowed if rewritten or overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Patentable claim 2 had depended directly from claim 1. Claim 2 has been amended to address the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and further has been amended to incorporate the limitations of original claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 3-7 depend directly or indirectly

from claim 2 and have been amended to address the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Hence, claims 3-7 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Patentable claim 14 depended from claim 13, which depended from claim 12 and which in turn dependent from claim 11. Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 11, 12 and 13. In this regard, there was some redundancy between previously presented claims 11 and 12. Amended claim 14 is collapsed somewhat, but is believed to include the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims.

The applicants are pleased to note that claims 15 and 16 are allowed.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is urged to contact applicants' attorney at the number below to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.
Atty. Reg. No. 30,066
Customer No. 001218
CASELLA & HESPOS LLP
274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703
New York, NY 10016
Tel. (212) 725-2450
Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: June 23, 2005